REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-17 and 20-23 are pending. Claims 15-17 and 20-23 have been rejected.

Claim 15 has been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 15-17 and 20-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,704 to McCanne et al. ("McCanne") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,633 to Welch ("Welch").

Applicants reserve the right to swear behind McCanne.

It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 15 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne in view of Welch.

Amended claim 15 reads as follows:

> A method, comprising:
>
> receiving a request for content having associated therewith an information object identified by a uniform resource locator (URL) including a redirector address;
>
> mapping, using a lookup table, the URL of the information object to a corresponding unicast address associated with an originating source for the information object;
>
> using the unicast address as an anycast address so as to obtain the information object from a nearest information object repository identified by a redirector identified by the redirector address, wherein the nearest information object repository is selected according to specified performance metrics that comprise average delay from the nearest information object repository to a source of the request, average processing delay at the nearest information object repository, reliability of a path from the nearest information object repository, available bandwidth in said path, and loads on the nearest information object repository;
>
> <u>directing the request to the nearest information object repository;</u>
>
> <u>determining if the information object repository has the information object;</u>

instructing the nearest information object repository to obtain a copy of the information object, if the nearest information object repository does not store the information object;

monitoring an established connection between a destination of the request and the nearest information object repository servicing the request; and

adjusting the established connection if network conditions of the established connection degrade by replacing the nearest information object repository with a different information object repository.

(Amended claim 15) (emphasis added)

The amendments are supported by the Specification (see, for example, paragraphs [0066]-[0067]).

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the references cited by the Examiner discloses directing the request to the nearest information object repository; determining if the information object repository has the information object; and instructing the nearest information object repository to obtain a copy of the information object, if the nearest information object repository does not store the information object, as recited in amended claim 15.

McCanne, in contrast, discloses content distribution system for operation over an internetwork including content peering arrangements. More specifically, McCanne discloses the following:

> Each CDN has an associated "content backbone", which is the set of AS's [autonomous systems] that advertise the anycast address(es) associated with that CDN. Within the content backbone, devices are deployed that are assigned the anycast address(es). Such devices might be Web servers, streaming-media servers, application-specific redirectors, DNS servers, the virtual address of a layer-4 switch load balancer, and so forth. Thus, any packet sent to such an address (whether it is a "stateful" TCP service connection or a "stateless" UDP transaction like DNS) is routed to the nearest instance of anycast-addressed device.

(McCanne, col. 15, lines 33-43) (emphasis added)

In particular, McCanne discloses the following:

> For example, **FIG. 9** shows a configuration where content backbone 1 is deployed in AS 100 using anycast address A*, while content backbone 2 is deployed across AS's 200 and 300 using anycast address B*. As shown in **FIG. 9**, B* advertises BGP routes. Devices A1* and A2* are assigned the anycast address A* and

> devices B1*, B2*, B3*, and B4* are assigned the anycast address B*. (Anycast-addressed devices also have a normal unique IP address assigned to them for network management access and so forth. We call this address the management address.) A packet sent to address A* is routed to the closest device in AS 100, whereas a packet sent to B* is routed to either AS 200 or 300 (depending on the BGP route preference). For example, if host Cl sends a packet addressed to A*, it is routed to device A1* along path 101. Likewise if host C1 sends a packet to B*, it is routed to device B1* along path 102. In contrast, if host C2 sends a packet to B*, it is routed to device B3* along path 103.

(McCanne, col. 15, lines 44-61) (emphasis added)

In contrast, amended claim 15 refers to directing the request to the nearest information object repository without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the nearest information object repository; determining if the information object repository has the information object; and instructing the nearest information object repository to obtain a copy of the information object, if the nearest information object repository does not store the information object.

Welch, in contrast, discloses allocating bandwidth of the data network by selecting the transmission rates for the data streams (Abstract), and also fails to disclose the discussed limitations of amended claim 15.

It is also respectfully submitted that McCanne does not teach or suggest a combination with Welch, and that Welch does not teach or suggest a combination with McCanne. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' own disclosure, to incorporate the content distribution system of McCanne into the bandwidth allocation system of Welch. Moreover, such a combination would still lack directing the request to the nearest information object repository; determining if the information object repository has the information object; and instructing the nearest information object repository to obtain a copy of the information object, if the nearest information object repository does not store the information object, as recited in amended claim 15.

Given that claims 16-17, and 21-23 depend from amended claim 15, and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-17, and 21-23 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne in view of Welch.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 06/29/2007

By: _____

Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No. 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Fax No. (408) 720-8383